

Appl. No. : 10/025,837
Filed : December 18, 2001

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed April 22, 2003, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments. With this amendment, Claims 10-12 are canceled, and Claims 1, 3-4, 8-9 and 13-15 are amended. Claims 1-9 and 13-15 are thus presented for further Examination.

Priority

The Examiner indicated that the Applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 00 870 305.0 application. In a telephonic conference with Daniel Hart, the Examiner agreed a certified copy was filed with the Response to Missing Parts filed April 18, 2002. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the certified copy has been provided.

Objection to the Abstract

The Examiner has objected to the abstract because it included legal phraseology. Applicants have amended the abstract to remove legal phraseology. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-9 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim what is regarded as the invention. Applicants note that the above amendments render any such rejections moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(3) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,105,364 to Zdybel. The Examiner has rejected Claims 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Zdybel.

Certain embodiments of the present invention relate to a device for testing the correct function of a thrust reverser present on an engine, which may be used indoors or outdoors. In the

presently claimed device, the collecting and recovering component of the test bed is external to the engine, and therefore, not a part of the engine.

In contrast, Zdybel is directed to a turbofan engine, including a pair of vectoring nozzles that are each attached to an aperture in the engine casing and in flow communication with the plenum chamber. The nozzles disclosed in Zybdel are actually part of the engine. Therefore, Zybdel does not teach or suggest a collecting and recovering component, comprising at least one deflector and two half-shells facing each other and open at least on one external face, that is external to the engine.

Furthermore, Zybdel does not teach or suggest a method of testing a turbojet engine at all. In particular, Zybdel does not teach or suggest a collecting and recovering component, comprising at least one deflector and two half-shells facing each other and open at least on one external face, that is external to the engine.

As described in the background at paragraph [0009], current test systems have several drawbacks. In particular, in current test systems, the circulation of the gas flow imposed by the test bed and that of the thrust reverser act in opposite directions, leading to degradation both of the components of the bed and of the thrust reverser, and also reinjection of burnt gases by the engine being tested, which may cause this engine to stall and risk damaging it. The system described in Zdybel would suffer from the same drawbacks since the collecting and recovering component is not external to the engine. In the presently claimed invention, these drawbacks are not present because the collecting and recovering component redirects the gases exiting the thrust reverser in the direction of the primary flow. Thus, there is not teaching or suggestion in the Zybdel reference of a test bed, or a method of testing a device, having a collecting and recovering component external to the engine, as described in the specification.

Accordingly, Applicant maintains Claims 1 and 13 are patentable over Zdybel. As Claims 2-9 and 14-15 are dependent on independent Claims 1 and 13, Claims 2-9 and 14-15 are patentable for at least these reasons.

Appl. No. : 10/025,837
Filed : December 18, 2001

CONCLUSION

The applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In light of these amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. Any claim amendments which are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are not made for patentability purposes, do not narrow the claims, and it is believed that the claims would satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability without the entry of such amendments.


If the Examiner has any questions that may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: Oct. 16, 2003

By: 
Daniel Hart
Registration No. 40,637
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

S:\DOCS\JOH\JOH-3493.DOC:dmb
100603